

JPRS 79507

24 November 1981

USSR Report

MILITARY AFFAIRS

No. 1635

FBIS FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semimonthly by the NTIS, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

Soviet books and journal articles displaying a copyright notice are reproduced and sold by NTIS with permission of the copyright agency of the Soviet Union. Permission for further reproduction must be obtained from copyright owner.

24 November 1981

USSR REPORT MILITARY AFFAIRS

No. 1635

CONTENTS

MINISTRY OF DEFENSE AND GENERAL STAFF

Table of Contents of 'ZARUBEZHNOYE VOYENNOYE OBOZRENIYE', May 1981..	1
--	---

PERCEPTIONS, VIEWS, COMMENTS

U.S. Intelligence Community Outlined (A. Tsvetkov; ZARUBEZHNOYE VOYENNOYE OBOZRENIYE, Aug 81).....	3
Editorial Comments on U.S. and NATO Aggressive Policies (Editorial; ZARUBEZHNOYE VOYENNOYE OBOZRENIYE, May 81).....	9
NATO: Comments on British Training Exercise 'Crusader-80' (N. Ivlev; ZARUBEZHNOYE VOYENNOYE OBOZRENIYE, May 81).....	15
Comments on U.S. Policy Toward Central America (V. Nebratenko; ZARUBEZHNOYE VOYENNOYE OBOZRENIYE, May 81)...	19
Reply to Readers on Tasks of United Nations Troops (G. Petrukhin; ZARUBEZHNOYE VOYENNOYE OBOZRENIYE, May 81)....	23
Comments on U.S. Expenditures for Radioelectronic Warfare (V. Afinov; ZARUBEZHNOYE VOYENNOYE OBOZRENIYE, May 81).....	27
Comments on Use of Propaganda Leaflets by U.S. Armed Forces (A. Tarakanov; ZARUBEZHNOYE VOYENNOYE OBOZRENIYE, May 81)....	28
Comments on Offensive Employment of U.S. Tank Battalion (A. Yegorov; ZARUBEZHNOYE VOYENNOYE OBOZRENIYE, May 81).....	30
Comments on Spain's Air Force and Ties With NATO (N. Belkin; ZARUBEZHNOYE VOYENNOYE OBOZRENIYE, May 81).....	32
Comments on Activities of U.S. Air Force Test Squadron (D. Valentinov; ZARUBEZHNOYE VOYENNOYE OBOZRENIYE, May 81)...	33

Comments on Air-to-Surface Tactical Missiles (B. Semenov; ZARUBEZHNOYE VOYENNOYE OBOZRENIYE, May 81).....	35
Comments on NATO Naval Training in the Atlantic (V. Khomenskiy; ZARUBEZHNOYE VOYENNOYE OBOZRENIYE, May 81)...	36
Comments on Physical Training Program of U.S. Marines (V. Sukhotskiy; ZARUBEZHNOYE VOYENNOYE OBOZRENIYE, May 81)...	42
Readers Comment on Usefulness of 'Foreign Military Review' (ZARUBEZHNOYE VOYENNOYE OBOZRENIYE, May 81).....	44

MINISTRY OF DEFENSE AND GENERAL STAFF

TABLE OF CONTENTS OF 'ZARUBEZHNOYE VOYENNOYE OBOZRENIYE', MAY 1981

Moscow ZARUBEZHNOYE VOYENNOYE OBOZRENIYE in Russian No 5, May 81 (signed to press 7 May 81) pp 1-2

[Full-text translated articles published in this issue of the JPRS report are indicated with an asterisk; excerpted translations - with a double asterisk]

[Text] CONTENTS	Page
*"Imperialism--On the Course of Aggression and Adventure	3
GENERAL MILITARY PROBLEMS	
**"Exercise of Great Britain's Armed Forces, 'Crusader-80'" - N. Ivlev	7
*"The United States: Policy of Aggression and Terror in Central America - V. Nebratenko	14
*"Troops of the United Nations" - G. Petrukhin	17
"Egypt (Physical-Geographic Conditions, Political System, Economy, Elements of Infrastructure)" - A. Luk'yanov	20
*"Expenditures of the United States on the Creation of Radioelectronic Warfare Equipment" - V. Afinov	25
*"Use of Leaflets in Psychological Warfare Operations"--A. Tarakanov	26
THE GROUND FORCES	
**"The U. S. Army Tank Battalion in the Attack" - A. Yegorov	27
"The Rank and File and Command Personnel of the Chinese Ground Forces" - P. Borisov	31
"Troop Sources of Electric Power" - G. Alekseyev	35
"The American Multiround Rocket Launcher System"--O. Surov	39
"The Japanese TAN-SAM Antiaircraft Missile System" - S. Pryadilov	41
"A New Control Level in the British Troops" - V. Yevgen'yev	42
THE AIR FORCE	
**"The Spanish Air Force" - N. Belkin	43
*"The U.S. Air Force 4484th Test Squadron" - D. Valentinov	49
**"Air-to-Surface Tactical Guided Missiles"--B. Semenov	50

"American Automatic Meteorological Station" - A. Kuchma	57
"Check Your Knowledge. Airplanes of the Capitalist Countries"	58

THE NAVAL FORCES

*"Combat Training of NATO Navies in the Atlantic" - V. Khomenskiy	59
"The Belgian Navy" - O. Aleksandrov	63
**"Physical Training of the U.S. Marines" - V. Sukhotskiy	65
"Electronic Equipment of the 'Atlantic-Mk4' Airplane" - G. Nikolayenko	70
"The Swedish 57-mm Naval Ordnance" - V. Morozov	72
"'Virginia'-Class Nuclear Guided Missile Ship" - S. Morekhod	74

INFORMATION, EVENTS, FACTS

"In the Spirit of Hegemonistic Claims"	75
"Italian 'Firos-25' Multiround Rocket Launcher System.....	75
"The Reason for Catastrophe--Pilot Error"	75
"Airborne Intelligence Exploitation System"	75
"American Flying Hospital"	75

FOREIGN MILITARY NEWS ITEMS	79
-----------------------------------	----

*LENINGRAD SEAMEN ON THE JOURNAL	80
--	----

COLORED INSERTS (Un-numbered pages)

American Multiround Rocket Launcher System

AJ37 "Viggen" Fighter-Bomber

F-5A Fighter-Bomber of the Spanish Air Force

American Nuclear Guided Missile Cruiser CGN41 "Arkansas"

COPYRIGHT: "Zarubezhnoye voyennoye obozreniye", 1981

6367

CSO: 1801/343

PERCEPTIONS, VIEWS, COMMENTS

U.S. INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY OUTLINED

Moscow ZARUBEZHNOYE VOYENNOYE OBOZRENIYE in Russian No 3, Aug 81 (signed to press 7 Aug 81) pp 3-8

[Article by Col A. Tsvetkov, doctor of military sciences: "The USA: Stake on Intensifying Espionage"]

[Text] The aggressive forces of imperialism, led by the United States, are placing in opposition to the peace-seeking foreign policy of the Soviet State a policy of adventures, arms race and aggravation of the international situation. Recently they have been engaged in increasingly more sophisticated and insidious activities against the socialist nations, as was emphasized at the 26th CPSU Congress. An important role in this is assigned to intelligence and subversive activities, which is particularly clearly seen in the example of the continuous development and improvement of the U.S. intelligence agencies.

U.S. intelligence, called "intelligence community" in the United States, constitutes an extensive system of various special agencies and services, which exert enormous influence on that country's domestic and foreign policy. At all stages of its existence it has devotedly served the expansionist aims of U.S. imperialism. This has been manifested in its global character, sharp anticommunist thrust, and assignment of intelligence functions to all the principal agencies participating in carrying out U.S. foreign policy.

The foundation of the U.S. intelligence system was laid immediately following World War II, when the United States sharply intensified the aggressiveness of its foreign policy, aimed at overthrowing the socialist system in the Soviet Union and preparations for a nuclear missile war against our country. The National Security Council (NSC), over which the U.S. president presides as chairman, was established during that period. A Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board was formed under the auspices of the NSC, containing representatives of all agencies and departments engaged in intelligence and subversive activities. Thus subversive activities directed against the world's first socialist state were officially acknowledged as state policy.

The Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), which was established in 1947 on the basis of the Office of Strategic Services, which was disbanded immediately following World War II, began to play a predominant role among all the intelligence organizations. Certain changes were also made in the organization of the intelligence entities of the armed services, the activities of which were initially coordinated

by a permanent joint intelligence committee, and subsequently by the Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA).

Both previously existing and newly established intelligence organizations were drawn into the orbit of espionage and subversive activities: the National Security Agency (NSA), the State Department's Bureau of Intelligence and Research, the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), etc.

Subsequently (1960's-1970's) the United States established a system of global espionage for implementing its strategic plans, which specify employment of more sophisticated weaponry, and began the extensive conduct of intelligence gathering, sabotage and terrorist activities abroad. The activities of all U.S. intelligence agencies became particularly intensified when the new administration entered the White House in January 1981.

At the present time, notes the newspaper NEW YORK TIMES, U.S. military and political leaders are endeavoring to improve the efficiency of intelligence agencies, to create a system of competing organizations, to establish a centralized dossier system, and to expand the program of covert operations abroad. "We should endeavor," President Reagan recently stated, "to do everything possible to ensure that the United States has the very finest intelligence."

The new administration decided first of all to strengthen the top-level intelligence directing entities. R. Allen, who served as a top NSC official under President R. Nixon, was appointed to the position of presidential national security adviser. He is known as a politician who holds extreme right-wing views, as an advocate of cold war, and as a staunch anticommunist.

The National Security Council, headed by the President, remains the highest intelligence directing body. Endeavoring further to step up intelligence gathering, sabotage and terrorist activities against the socialist and liberated nations, Reagan reestablished, at the suggestion of the CIA director, the Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board, which had been abolished by the preceding administration.

The Central Intelligence Agency, which is directly under the National Security Council, is the nucleus of the U.S. "intelligence community." The principal tasks of CIA include the gathering of military and political intelligence on a global scale, subversive and terrorist activities (covert operations) abroad, analysis and evaluation of obtained information, reporting this information to the government, and coordination of the activities of U.S. intelligence agencies.

While no fundamental changes have yet been made in the structure of CIA (central edifice and edifice abroad, domestic branches) since the new administration took over at the White House, at the agency's administrative level there has been clearly noted a trend toward strengthening it with experienced professional intelligence people. For example, W. Casey, Reagan's campaign manager, who during World War II served as chief of the European division of the Office of Strategic Services, was appointed Director of Central Intelligence, experienced intelligence officer J. Bross was named his special assistant, and W. Inman, former director of the National Security Agency (NSA), who is liked and trusted by the President, was named deputy director of central intelligence. The U.S. weekly newsmagazine NEWSWEEK recently stated that Casey will devote special attention to agent

activities, while Inman will concentrate his efforts on making the CIA administrative edifice more efficient and maintaining "warm relations" with Congress. As regards proposed changes in the organizational structure of CIA, a major effort will be made in this area, to quote Inman, aimed at strengthening the clandestine services, counterintelligence and analysis, as well as improving the direction of covert operations abroad. Apparently these questions, as is emphasized in the foreign press, will be finally settled after the U.S. Senate passes legislation on the CIA, including regulations providing for a substantial broadening of the functions and independence of this organization.

Intelligence agencies of the U.S. Department of Defense comprise an important part of the "intelligence community." They include the following: Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA), the intelligence operations of the armed services, the National Security Agency, and the military mapping and geodesy program. A special position is occupied by sabotage-intelligence units trained to carry out "special operations" (actions against the worker and national liberation movements, progressive governments, actions in support of pro-American regimes, etc) in the world's "hottest spots."

DIA is one of the principal U.S. intelligence organizations. Its principal missions, Pentagon chief C. Weinberger recently stated, consist in closer supervision of the armed forces intelligence services and the military attaché system, in improving the quality of intelligence assessments, and in promoting and giving priority to research and development to achieve further improvement of intelligence gathering resources and means.

The DIA edifice has recently undergone certain changes. In particular, the information service and science and technology intelligence components were beefed up, as well as the department supervising the operations of military intelligence operations abroad.

The NSA has the task of organizing and conducting electronic intelligence activities on a global scale, of breaking the codes of foreign countries, of coordinating the activities of other U.S. intelligence agencies in this area, of devising codes for government, diplomatic and military communications, of ensuring secrecy of information transmitted by these channels, and of supervising the security services of the armed forces and the security service of other agencies.

As was recently noted by the U.S. magazine PROGRESSIVE, a new function of the NSA is organization of operations to penetrate embassies and representations of foreign countries in the United States and abroad, with the objective of stealing codes and code machines. A characteristic feature of further expansion of the area of activities of the NSA is stepped-up domestic electronic surveillance with the aid of a Harvest computer hooked into the Bell Telephone network, as well as 150 radio intercept stations scattered all over the United States. To quote the graphic definition given to the NSA in the Western press, it is an "all-pervasive electronic monster."

In recent years there has occurred considerable improvement in the collection, processing and dissemination of information acquired by NSA resources, and there has been an improvement in coordinating its activities with CIA and FBI counterpart

systems. In particular, these agencies have begun utilizing large-capacity high-speed computers for processing intelligence information.

At the beginning of the 1980's NSA substantially stepped up research in the area of cryptography and the development of coding machines, working in close collaboration with the Defense Analysis Institute.

Nor is the State Department's intelligence service lagging behind the other U.S. agencies in the area of stepping up espionage activities. Reorganization resulted in an agency replacing the Bureau of Intelligence and Research. The structure of this service has remained essentially unchanged (six regional and several functional divisions), but it has substantially expanded the manpower of components engaged in assessing information on the USSR and the other nations of the socialist community, as well as those components whose functions involve analysis of the state of the economy, science, etc.

It is not surprising that former general A. Haig, who now heads the State Department, has hired a good many professional intelligence officers, known for their hostility toward the Soviet Union and the other nations of the socialist community.

As is indicated by the foreign press, the activities of the State Department's intelligence service in many ways duplicate CIA activities, in connection with which certain conflicts have recently arisen between these two organizations, which the new administration is endeavoring to smooth over by encouraging "healthy competition" among the principal intelligence services.

Recently there has been a substantial broadening of the functions of the intelligence service of the Department of Energy which, with the aid of agents and technical means, obtains information on scientific discoveries and research in the area of nuclear physics and on the existence of and quantity of fissionable materials in the possession of the nuclear powers, particularly the USSR.

Such an organization as the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), which is a component of the U.S. Department of Justice, is also involved in espionage activity. In addition to intensification of the function of political investigation and counterintelligence, the Bureau has recently stepped up its subversive activities abroad. As was reported by the newspaper WASHINGTON POST, it currently "maintains its own agents in the majority of the world's capitals as well as in many other cities in various countries."

The new economic shocks which the capitalist world has been experiencing in the last decade have expanded the activities of the Special Service of the U.S. Treasury Department, the efforts of which are concentrated not only on studying the financial situation in the leading capitalist countries but also on obtaining information on the credit and finance system of the nations of the socialist community and its capabilities to finance defense measures.

The new administration in the White House, as is emphasized by the U.S. press, has resolved "to expand the capabilities of all types of intelligence, viewing this as an inseparable part of the reestablishment of U.S. military might and political prestige."

The "intelligence community" discussed above utilizes various types of intelligence resources and means (agents, electronic, aerospace, sea and land) for carrying out intelligence and sabotage activities.

Agent activities, in the opinion of U.S. experts, are capable of successfully accomplishing missions of obtaining intelligence of a political, economic, science and technology, and military nature, as well as the conduct of "special operations" on the territory of other countries. It is believed that in the final analysis only agents can provide reliable information on the enemy's actual motives and intentions. These activities are conducted by CIA stations abroad (they total more than 100), the Department of Defense military attaché system, the diplomatic corps, as well as other organizations, utilizing for this purpose specially trained personnel sent abroad in an official or legitimate capacity (journalists, scientists, tourists etc), as well as persons sent into a country illegally, and recruited unstable citizens of foreign countries.

The Reagan Administration is devoting particular attention to improvement in the clandestine activities of agents and improving their professional skills. As was emphasized by the U.S. press, reliable deep-cover agents, capable of carrying out their mission at the most critical moment, are needed in the space age.

The present administration attaches equal importance to covert and terrorist operations abroad. Confirmation of this is Reagan's official statement about increasing U.S. support to the saboteur bands inserted into Afghan territory, as well as the sending to El Salvador, at Reagan's orders, of a large group of "Green Berets" to conduct punitive operations, as well as a large saboteur-intelligence detachment into Laos. Reporting details of the latter operation, the WASHINGTON POST stated that it involved the participation of several dozen saboteurs, the actions of whom were directed by Rear Admiral J. Tuttle, deputy director of DIA.

A characteristic feature of further sophistication of U.S. electronic intelligence, foreign military experts acknowledge, is the development of unified (stationary and mobile) automated radio, radiotechnical, radar and electro-optical intelligence systems which operate in combination -- with employment of ground, sea, air and space facilities and hardware. The NSA alone has more than 2000 intercept and direction finding posts, situated both in the continental United States and abroad. They can be found, stated the U.S. magazine PROGRESSIVE, in any U.S. embassy, and in many other cities: Istanbul (Turkey), Darmstadt (FRG), Brindisi (Italy), West Berlin, as well as on the island of Crete, in Morocco and Norway.

The United States continues its strong emphasis on satellite reconnaissance, because of its global coverage and capability to surveil enormous land and sea areas in a short period of time, to detect various installations, precisely to determine their position coordinates and to pass on the obtained information to interested agencies. These activities are based on various artificial earth satellites and reusable manned spacecraft of the Space Shuttle Program.

In recent years the Pentagon has continued building up the capabilities of the combined air reconnaissance system, primarily by improving manned aircraft (U-2, SR-71A, RC-135) and by improving airborne intelligence-gathering equipment (photographic cameras, lasers, side-scanning radars, and infrared instruments). As

a result, U.S. intelligence agencies have the capability of rapidly acquiring detailed information on the enemy in continental and ocean theaters on a real-time or close to real-time basis.

An important role in the conduct of air reconnaissance is assigned to E-3A Sentry long-range radar support and control aircraft of the AWACS system, which carry on board sophisticated reconnaissance gear. They are a part of the U.S. Air Force 552d Wing and, as we know, they are capable of detecting targets at considerable distances, without entering enemy airspace, and are already flying intelligence missions targeted at the European socialist nations. Judging from reports in the press, the Pentagon is presently considering the question of further expanding aerial espionage against the Warsaw Pact member nations by deploying in Western Europe, within the framework of NATO, an AWACS system consisting of 18 E-3A aircraft.

A new step in improving U.S. sea and ocean reconnaissance assets was completion of establishment of a global enemy missile-firing nuclear submarine protection system, which can maintain surveillance over vast stretches of ocean. It is based on the SOSUS stationary long-range hydroacoustic surveillance system (a network of hydrophones sited in the Atlantic and other regions and linked to shore receiving stations).

SOSUS importantly supplements other ocean reconnaissance and surveillance systems (SASS, RDSS, and others). The Navy devotes particular attention to aerial radio-electronic reconnaissance. In particular, ER-3E Orion aircraft are equipped with the ARIES radio and radar reconnaissance system, which automatically detects, determines bearing, and analyzes signals emitted by radio communications equipment and radar surveillance, guidance and identification systems.

The U.S. Army, which is improving ground reconnaissance, is equipping units and subunits with new intelligence gathering devices. In particular, by 1983 the division echelon is to be equipped with the REMBASS system, which comprises a network of various sensors which transmit signals to a mobile center. In addition, reconnaissance and electronic warfare agencies are to be unified at the corps echelon.

It is apparent from the above that U.S. leaders, making the decision to step up espionage activities, are continuing to improve the intelligence system by reorganizing its principal services and unifying them into systems, adopting new intelligence gathering equipment, improving the quality and speeding up processing of intelligence. This once again confirms the conclusion of the 26th CPSU Congress that there has recently been a sharp increase in the aggressiveness of imperialism, especially U.S. imperialism. All this obliges Soviet military personnel to work constantly to increase their political vigilance and combat readiness.

COPYRIGHT: "Zarubezhnoye voyennoye obozreniye", 1981

3024

CSO: 8144/0103

PERCEPTIONS, VIEWS, COMMENTS

EDITORIAL COMMENTS ON U.S. AND NATO AGGRESSIVE POLICIES

Moscow ZARUBEZHNOYE VOYENNOYE OBOZRENIYE in Russian No 5, May 81 (signed to press 7 May 81) pp 3-6

[Editorial: "Imperialism--On the Course of Aggression and Adventure"]

[Text] The fortieth anniversary of Hitlerite Germany's unleashing of an aggressive war against the USSR will be marked on 22 June 1981. This date has gone down in the history of our country as the start of the great and most difficult tests which befell the lot of the Soviet people. The very existence of the first socialist state in the world was threatened.

German militarism prepared long and persistently for the attack on the USSR. The leading countries of the capitalist world rendered comprehensive assistance to the Germany which was defeated in World War I, as a result of which a tremendous military-economic potential was created and the armed forces were revived in a short time. Material and spiritual preparation for war against the Soviet Union was accomplished at especially rapid rates after the Hitlerite party came to power, the core of this party's ideology being shameless anticommunism and its main political goal being the destruction of the USSR which was looked upon as the most important stage on the road to the establishment of the fascist Reich's world domination.

The Soviet government persistently struggled for the peace which our people needed to implement the plans for the building of socialism. However, as is known the bourgeois governments remained deaf to the voice of reason which was emanating from the Kremlin: German fascism seemed to them to be a force which was capable, according to their calculations, of crushing the USSR in whose guise they saw a threat to capitalism. How the criminal policy of supporting Hitlerism and urging it on to aggression against the Soviet Union ended is well known: almost all the countries of Western and Central Europe were occupied by Germany and the danger of fascist slavery hung over the entire world.

The historic service of the Soviet people to mankind was that they frustrated the accomplishment of these delirious, misanthropic plans. The Soviet Union emerged from the mortal combat with the shock detachment of world imperialism stronger, its international authority grew immeasurably, and the ideas of Marxism-Leninism received even wider recognition.

The most important result of World War II is the formation of the world socialist system. Under the influence of the USSR's victory, the peoples of colonies rose up for a more active struggle for national and social liberation and actions of the workers of the capitalist countries assumed a broader scope.

However, such an objective course of development of events did not suit the imperialists. They saw the clear signs of their inevitable failure in the growth of the revolutionary movement, in the disintegration of the world colonial empire, and in the strengthening of socialism's international positions. The role of "savior" of capitalism from the concocted "Soviet threat" was assumed by the United States which received the anticommunist baton from German fascism.

Hegemonism was always inherent to the monopolists across the ocean, but they began to behave especially impudently after World War II.

The claims of the United States to the winning of world domination were proclaimed back in 1947 in the not unknown Truman Doctrine. "There is no country stronger than the United States. Possessing such strength, we must assume leadership of the world," declared former American President Truman. This doctrine was perceived by all international reaction as a signal to prepare a "crusade" against the Soviet Union and for a struggle against the revolutionary and national-liberation movement. It openly proclaimed the "cold war" policy, the main goal of which became the discrediting of real socialism and the shattering of its foundations by ideological sabotage and the weakening of the USSR in every possible way.

In characterizing the aggressive "cold war" policy of the imperialist states in the postwar period, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev wrote in the book "Renaissance": "It reigned for long years, in essence for two decades. It was not the first and, unfortunately, not the last case where the capitalist powers, placing great hopes on our difficulties, tried to dictate their will to us and to interfere in our internal affairs.... And so, did we perish? Retreat? Stop our movement? No! The overseas wise men miscalculated in their policy, which it is useful to remember today since it is both instructive and timely."

The reactionary expansionist policy of the "cold war" received its embodiment in the formation of the aggressive NATO bloc and other military-political groupings, in the creation of military bases around the USSR, and in the whipping up of international tension, the unrestrained arms race, and the conduct of an adventuristic course in world arena. According to data of the American Brookings Institute, from 1946 through 1975, the United States resorted to the use or demonstration of military force to attain its political and diplomatic goals 215 times, in which regard it threatened directly or indirectly to employ strategic nuclear weapons 19 times. It conducted war twice during this period--in Korea and Indochina, and it also undertook armed interference in Indonesia, Lebanon, and the Dominican Republic, organized revolutions in Chile and Guatemala, and so forth.

The successes of the USSR's peace-loving policy and the strengthening of positions of the socialist commonwealth and of all progressive forces caused the attempt of the forces of world reaction headed by the ruling circles of the United States to frustrate the process of detente on the boundary of the 1970's and the 1980's by whipping up the arms race, expanding interference in the internal affairs of various

states, and increasing international tension. The main goal of the imperialist circles is to attain military superiority over the USSR and the other Warsaw Pact countries so as to conduct their hegemonistic policy "from a position of strength," that is, as they like to express it in Washington, to restore the United States' "leading role" in the world.

The American military-industrial complex, which the relaxation of international tension does not suit, has stated its "weighty" utterance. Obediently heeding its orders, the Carter administration abandoned the international obligations which it had formerly assumed, sharply aggravated relations with the USSR and the Warsaw Pact countries, and began to draw closer to the Chinese hegemonists.

The reason for this is that the Peace Program proclaimed at the 24th CPSU Congress and developed by our party's 25th congress is in conflict with the interests of the Western monopolies which are becoming fabulously wealthy on the production and sale of arms. They saw in the policy of detente a danger to imperialism's positions. They are frightened by the successes of the Soviet Union and the other countries of socialism in economic construction and they are awed by the positive changes and processes in the world and the strengthening of progressive regimes in liberated countries. Detente is the path to peace, to the banning of weapons of mass destruction, and to disarmament, and it is namely this which the owners of the biggest military concerns do not want.

In order somehow to justify the abrupt turn in policy, the American "free" press, on orders of the White House and the Pentagon, dragged into the light the old myth about a "Soviet military threat", about "expansionism typical of communism," and so forth. To these ravings the new President Reagan, who serves the entire same military-industrial complex, added the absurd accusation that the Soviet Union participates in "international terrorism." Displaying the most complete disregard of the rights and aspirations of peoples, Washington is trying to portray the liberation movement of the popular masses as the manifestation of "terrorism" and, under the screen of combating it, is initiating an attack against the forces which are struggling for independence and, first of all, against the young states which have selected a socialist orientation.

The scales of the new, unprecedented stage of the arms race into which the military-political leadership of the United States is plunging its country is shown by the planned sharp increase in military appropriations (by approximately seven percent). They are planned at 233.8 billion dollars for the next fiscal year and altogether it is contemplated that about 1.5 trillion dollars will be allotted for military purposes in the next five-year period.

These colossal resources will go primarily for the development of U.S. strategic offensive nuclear forces, which include the creation of the mobile-based [MBR] MX, the "Trident" PLARB [nuclear ballistic missile submarine], and new strategic bombers. Altogether, the Pentagon has already planned about 450 military programs, including the accelerated development of laser and space weapons and expanding the production of chemical weapons. In Washington, they have again begun to speak about plans for emplacing neutron weapons in Europe. Thus, the material preconditions are being created to implement an aggressive strategy directed toward the preparation and unleashing of large and small wars.

The decision to emplace in Western Europe new American nuclear missiles--108 "Pershing-2" guided missile launchers and 464 land-based cruise missiles (116 mobile launchers)--was assessed in the summary report of the CPSU Central Committee to the 26th Party Congress as the obvious intention to change the military balance which had developed in Europe in favor of NATO. We are speaking about a modern, qualitatively new type of weapon which is capable of launching strikes against objectives located in the European part of the USSR for aggressive purposes with high accuracy. Great Britain, the FRG, and Italy have already expressed agreement to offer their territory for this "Eurostrategic weapon." It is appropriate to note that just as more than 40 years ago, influential circles of some countries of "free" (but in fact dependent on the United States) Western Europe are encouraging the militaristic, anticommunist activity of imperialism's aggressive forces. Evidently, the experience of connivance in the Hitlerite claims to world domination taught them nothing. They are obediently gravitating toward the policy of the White House and, in order to show their "independence," themselves often excel in the fable of anti-Soviet cock-and-bull stories.

Recently as never before, the foreign policy of the United States--the main power of the imperialist camp--bears an adventuristic nature. The most aggressive circles of imperialism are ready to risk the vital interests of mankind for the sake of their narrow mercenary goals.

The notorious Directive No 59 of President Carter (by the way, it has not been rescinded by the new administration) presents great danger for the peoples of the entire world. Its essence is that the United States openly declared its "right" to launch the first nuclear strike first of all against the most important military objectives and organs of the highest state and military leadership of the USSR and, in so doing, is trying to reconcile people to the thought of the admissibility of nuclear-missile war.

The most aggressive imperialist circles and, first of all in the United States, are reflecting more and more often on the categories of domination and compulsion in relation to other states and peoples. Washington willfully declared a number of regions of the world (the Near East, Africa, the Indian Ocean) which are rich in oil, uranium, and nonferrous metals a sphere of its "vital interests"; the American war machine is actively penetrating there and intends to settle down there for a long time. It is counting on asserting for itself the "right" to operate the raw material resources of tremendous regions of the world unceremoniously by brute strength and concentrated military force. Thus, drawn to the area of the Persian Gulf is an American naval armada for the reinforcement of which Washington succeeded in enlisting ships of the navies of France, Great Britain, the FRG, and Australia. The interventionist "Rapid Deployment Force" is being organized hastily and is intended for the preservation of anti-popular regimes, intimidating young independent states, and the defense of the predatory interests of the imperialist monopolies. The total strength of the gendarme corps may reach 600,000 men, and the most mobile component--100,000-110,000.

An important role in the arsenal of aggressive means of American imperialism is played by the "base strategy"--the creation of military bases and strong points on the territory of countries which adjoin the borders of socialist states and the areas of "hot spots" and the garrisoning of units and subunits of the U.S. Armed

Forces here. According to reports in the foreign press, the Pentagon has about 2,500 bases and various military installations in 30 countries of the world. Approximately 500,000 American servicemen are permanently located beyond the borders of their country. Recently, in trying to cover the richest oil-bearing region of the world--the Persian Gulf--with the "mantle of military might," the Pentagon has made its "base strategy" noticeably more active here along with the expansion of the American naval presence and the creation of the "Rapid Deployment Force" which is aimed at this region. It is creating "nests of aggression" on the island of Diego Garcia and in Oman, Kenya, and Somalia.

In Washington's plans for the conduct of an aggressive adventurist policy in the Near East, substantial attention is devoted to Israel and Egypt where it is also planned to create American military bases and depots of heavy armament and to quarter subunits of the U.S. Armed Forces. Attaining a dominant position in this region, the United States set forth on the path of splitting the Arab world and organizing the separate Camp David Agreement between Israel and Egypt, which hurled backward a Near East settlement and aggravated the situation here.

As a result of the activation of wide-scale militaristic preparations in the Indian Ocean, the Persian Gulf, and in the Near East, Washington is striving to intensify significantly the threat to the Soviet Union from the south. One of the obstacles in the path of realization of these aggressive plans in the United States is considered to be Afghanistan to which the USSR is rendering wide assistance on the request of the legal Afghan government. In organizing a "crusade" against this sovereign democratic state, the United States took part in an undeclared war against it and publicly declared its intention to arm the counterrevolutionary bands of mercenaries sent to Afghan territory for sabotage and murder in the future, too.

With the same cynical unceremoniousness, the White House is taking under its wing the direct accomplices of the South African racists who are sowing death and destruction on the territory of Angola--the UNITA terrorist groups. The growing military assistance to the anti-popular junta of Salvador, which is trying to drown the national liberation movement in blood, cannot be considered as anything but the direct export of counterrevolution to Central America.

The drawing together of the United States, Japan, and a number of NATO countries with China, which are striving to use its hostility toward the Soviet Union and the socialist commonwealth for their own imperialist goals, has acquired an especially dangerous character for the cause of peace and the freedom of peoples.

In fanning a military psychosis, the militarists in the United States and the other capitalist countries do not tire of repeating the thesis, which is devoid of any basis, that allegedly the states of the Warsaw Pact recently achieved military superiority over the NATO countries. The bourgeois politicians need all this in order to wring from the purses of the taxpayers more resources for the production of weapons and military equipment and to whip up the arms race. Such actions of influential circles of Western countries received a worthy reproof in the summary report of the CPSU Central Committee to the 26th Party Congress: "We have not achieved and are not achieving military superiority over the other side. This is not our policy. But neither can we permit the creation of such superiority over us. Such attempts as well as talks with us from a position of strength are absolutely without prospect!"

All this should be known to those who forgot the lessons of history, who forgot how the attempt undertaken by fascist Germany to destroy the Soviet Union, turn back the wheel of history, and halt progress ended. Hitler, you see, also talked profusely about a "Soviet threat" and frightened political figures and Philistines with the bugaboo of communism.

The USSR countered the aggressive adventuristic policy of imperialism with the peace-loving foreign-policy program put forth in the report of Comrade I. I. Brezhnev at the 26th Party Congress. Its main goal is to do everything possible to lead peoples out from under the threat of nuclear war and maintain peace on Earth.

It was also stressed at the congress that the contemporary complex and contradictory international situation requires constant attention to questions of strengthening the defensive might of the motherland and its Armed Forces. The congress expressed its confidence that the Soviet servicemen, in the future, too, will reliably stand guard over the peaceful labor of the Soviet people--the builders of communism. The men of the Armed Forces are responding to this highest evaluation with new successes in soldierly labor, in combat and political training, and in the improvement of military skill. They understand perfectly: conditions can be created for the Soviet people and the peoples of the fraternal countries for peaceful labor only by ensuring the readiness of the Armed Forces to repel aggression daily. As long as we are militarily strong and as long as we are spiritually strong by our devotion to the great cause of communism and our solidarity around the Leninist party, the enemy will not dare to encroach on our borders and our historic achievements!

COPYRIGHT: "Zarubezhnoye voyennoye obozreniye", 1981.

6367

CSO: 1801/343

PERCEPTIONS, VIEWS, COMMENTS

NATO: COMMENTS ON BRITISH TRAINING EXERCISE 'CRUSADER-80'

Moscow ZARUBEZHNOYE VOYENNOYE OBOZRENIYE in Russian No 5, May 81 (signed to press 7 May 81) pp 7-14

[Article by Maj Gen N. Ivlev: "Exercise of Great Britain's Armed Forces, 'Crusader-80'"]

[Excerpts] Openly setting course for the attainment of military superiority over the Warsaw Pact states, the leadership of the aggressive North Atlantic bloc is speeding up the arms race and making more active military preparations in all directions. Under cover of ballyhoo about an alleged "Soviet threat," it is trying to emplace new types of nuclear missiles in a number of the bloc's European countries. The ruling circles of the United States and Great Britain are displaying special zeal in this regard. "The clear intention to change the military balance which has developed in Europe in NATO's favor is present," declared the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, in the summary report of the CPSU Central Committee to the 26th Party Congress.

The militarists of the main NATO countries, evidently, are not pondering the fact that even without cruise missiles and without neutron weapons Western Europe has already been transformed into a vast military range where large-scale exercises and maneuvers by the troops of the bloc are organized annually in the immediate proximity of the borders of the socialist commonwealth's countries. And however much the NATO generals hypocritically try to declare the exclusively defensive nature of the exercises being conducted, their aggressive trend is becoming more and more obvious.

Nor was the autumn of 1980 an exception when a series of maneuvers of the combined armed forces of NATO and the national commands of the member countries was conducted against a common operational-strategic background and in accordance with a single concept under the code name "Autumn Forge-80." As the Western press noted, they included the combined exercise of British troops, "Crusader-80" (1 September-7 October). The area for its conduct encompassed the territory of Great Britain, Belgium, the Netherlands, and the FRG. In addition to British troops American, West German, Dutch, and Belgian large units and units took part in it.

The overall concept of the exercise envisioned the following situation. In response to increased activity in preparations of the Warsaw Pact countries ("Orange") for war, the NATO leadership decided to reinforce the Northern Army Group stationed in the Central European TVD [theater of military operations] rapidly by lifting troops

from Great Britain (consisting of I Army Corps, British Army of the Rhine [BRA]) and from the continental United States. The overall plan for "Crusader-80" which envisioned the conduct of three independent exercises against a single operational-strategic background was also worked out on the basis of such an obviously provocative premise.

"Square Leg." In the course of this exercise, main attention was paid to working out questions of complete mobilization and checking the civil defense system on the territory of Great Britain. About 30,000 servicemen were actually prepared for a lift, including up to 20,000 men called up from the reserve (territorial army). As the Western press stresses, this is approximately one third of the number of troops which will be sent to reinforce the British Army of the Rhine in case of the actual emergence of an extraordinary situation. The number of reservists trained and maintained in a high stage of readiness is now about 63,000 men, and it may soon reach 73,000 men (as envisioned by tables of organization and equipment). Regular lessons are conducted with the reserve personnel (as a rule, once a week in the evening), and during the year they are also called up for assemblies (primarily for 12 days), in the course of which weapons are studied and the actions of subunits and units in various types of battle are worked out.

On this exercise, for the period of call-up of this military contingent and its preparation for transfer to the FRG increased combat readiness was introduced in the tactical aviation and air defense [PVO] units, and the number of men and weapons on duty in case of repelling a possible air attack by the "Orange" was increased. At the same time, military transport aircraft and ferries were brought to complete readiness for the transfer of troops and cargo and the personnel who had been called up were engaged in tactical and marching-drill exercises to knock the subunits together after their complete outfitting. As was noted in the foreign press, the reservists arrived at their destinations (subunits, units) quickly after receiving orders and their commanders, especially the chaplains, displayed maximum effort to "inspire" the soldiers to defend the interests of Great Britain far from its territory. All this was presented under the guise of the necessity to strengthen the defense of West German territory in close coordination with the allies in the North Atlantic bloc in connection with the "growing threat from the East." According to the evaluation of foreign military specialists, the leadership of Great Britain conducted the mobilization of the reserve contingent and the transfer of troops to reinforce the British Army of the Rhine on such a scale for the first time since the conclusion of World War II. And by this, the government of M. Thatcher tried to stress its "devotion" to NATO and the United States which is demanding of its bloc allies the further militarization of their countries.

"Jog Trot." The main content of this exercise was the organization and practical transfer of troops and cargo from Great Britain to Central Europe. About 30,000 men, more than 850 tanks and other tracked vehicles, and several thousand units of other combat equipment (including 350 helicopters) were delivered by air and sea.

As was noted in the foreign press, the command of the armed forces expressed satisfaction that about 30,000 servicemen as well as a large quantity of equipment and weapons (altogether, somewhat more than two divisions) were delivered to the FRG from Great Britain in 48 hours. It was also stressed that the gaming of this stage of the exercise confirmed the practicability of the mobilization plans (which were

checked for the first time since the completion of World War II) and also demonstrated the increased capabilities of the command of the British troops to reinforce the BRA rapidly. For example, it was reported in the foreign press that in case of necessity it is possible to transfer two and, if necessary, even three times more troops and equipment than on this exercise to the FRG from Great Britain in 48 hours (or at least in 72 hours). The personnel (primarily men called up) demonstrated rather high ability and skillful actions in the course of loading. Thus, the time for loading a Boeing 747 aircraft with servicemen (about 400 men) with necessary armament was only 20 minutes.

In the course of the practical lifts, as indicated in the Western press, great attention was devoted to working out questions of air cover (by air defense men and weapons and aviation) of units and subunits when moving out, in embarkation (disembarkation) areas, and during the sea passage. For this, their organizational weapons were reinforced, fighter aviation was in a state of increased readiness at airfields, and some aircraft even patrolled in established areas. In addition, a portion of the Navy's forces were brought to increased combat readiness to organize antisubmarine defense and ensure the protection of the transports during the sea passage as well as in the ports of embarkation and disembarkation.

"Spear Point-80"-- a two-sided exercise of the British I Army Corps (with the participation of troops of the United States, the FRG, Belgium, and the Netherlands) was, as the foreign press notes, the biggest within the framework of "Crusader-80" and the "Autumn Forge-80" maneuvers. It was conducted during the period of 15-26 September on the territory of the FRG in the area of the cities of Celle, Stadthagen, and on along the border between the FRG and the GDR. The troops actually operated in the area of the cities of Hannover, Gutersloh, and Hildesheim on an area of more than 10,000 square kilometers. Western military experts stress that this exercise area abounded with rivers (Leine, Weser, and others), lakes, and swampy sectors and created great difficulties for the operations of the troops (especially for tank units and large units). In this regard, the conditions for conduct of the exercise approximated an actual situation which may develop in war. Moreover, the two-sided nature of the exercise, in their opinion, gave the staffs and troops the opportunity to acquire the experience of battles with a "real enemy" in the conduct of an offensive as well as in the defense on one of the main directions--the Ruhr.

The main goal of the exercise, according to reports in the foreign press, consisted of checking the combat capabilities of a British reinforced army corps which, in coordination with the troops of the allies as the Northern Army Group, is to play an important role in the organization and conduct of combat operations (in the offense and defense) in the initial period of a war in the Central European theater of military operations. The following problems were also worked out: bringing corps units up to strength through reserve personnel who were mobilized and lifted from Great Britain; checking the combat readiness of staffs and large units with their change from peacetime to wartime status; the departure of troops to areas for operational purposes; the conduct of delaying, defensive, and offensive operations with the assault crossing of big water obstacles; the dropping (landing) of airborne forces; accomplishment of coordination between the staffs of various national affiliations and of ground forces with tactical aviation; the organization of air defense and MTO [logistical support]; and improving the forms and methods for the secret control of troops.

In the opinion of the British command the exercise "Spear Point-80" as well as "Crusader-80" as a whole proceeded in an organized and dynamic manner. In the course of the exercise a large-scale operation on lifting reinforcements from Great Britain to the Central European theater of military operations was conducted for the first time and "dual basing" units which were lifted from the United States operated for the first time in the zone of I Army Corps, British Army of the Rhine.

The conduct of provocative NATO militaristic demonstrations having an open anti-Soviet and antisocialist nature requires that the Soviet servicemen constantly raise political vigilance and combat readiness so as to provide a worthy rebuff to any aggressor jointly with the men of the fraternal armies of the countries in the socialist commonwealth.

COPYRIGHT: "Zarubezhnoye voyennoye obozreniye", 1981.

6367

CSO: 1801/343

PERCEPTIONS, VIEWS, COMMENTS

COMMENTS ON U.S. POLICY TOWARD CENTRAL AMERICA

Moscow ZARUBEZHNOYE VOYENNOYE OBOZRENIYE in Russian No 5, May 81 (signed to press 7 May 81) pp 14-17

[Article by Lt Col V. Nebratenko: "The United States: Policy of Aggression and Terror in Central America"]

[Text] The region of Central America and the Caribbean basin has recently been transformed into one of the danger spots of international tension. The main culprit here is American imperialism which is striving for complete dominion in the Western hemisphere. Declaring the Caribbean Sea its "internal lake," the United States is building up a military presence at bases of a number of island states of this region and is accomplishing direct interference in the internal affairs of Central American countries. It has openly set its course toward the suppression of the liberation movement which engenders conflicts that threaten to develop into a big conflagration. But you see, it was pointed out at the 26th CPSU Congress, extinguishing hot spots of military conflicts "is not an easy matter. It would be much easier to implement prevention and forestall the appearance of such hot spots."

The increase in the activity of militaristic, aggressive measures by Washington in Central America and the Caribbean basin is caused by the fact that here the anti-imperialist movement of the peoples is being initiated more and more widely. Inspired by the successes of socialist construction in Cuba and the victory of the democratic revolution in Nicaragua, the patriots of Salvador have raised the banner of struggle against the reactionary junta. The ranks of the fighters in Guatemala, Honduras, Haiti, and Puerto Rico have become more serried. The struggle for genuine sovereignty and national independence is being initiated in the Virgin Islands which are actually a colony of the United States.

"During the last five-year period alone," noted Comrade L. I. Brezhnev in the summary report of the CPSU Central Committee to the 26th CPSU Congress, "10 new states in Africa, the Caribbean basin, and Oceania received independence and were immediately recognized by the Soviet Union." But, as he stressed, "the imperialists are not suited by the strengthening of the independence of the liberated countries. By thousands of ways and methods, they are trying to tie these countries to themselves in order to dispose of their national wealth more freely and to use their territories in their strategic concepts."

The essence of this policy was manifested especially graphically in Central America and the Caribbean basin. The weakening of American positions in the region from which United States monopolies are pumping out colossal profits from exploitation of natural wealth and the use of a cheap labor force is evaluated in Washington as a "threat to national security" and causes a fit of militarist hysteria in the United States.

In striving to place the events which are occurring in this area under its control, the Pentagon has formed on a permanent basis the headquarters of a joint operations force (Key West Naval Base, Florida) whose primary mission is the conduct of subversive operations against progressive regimes in Central America and the Caribbean basin. Its functions include the working out of measures for the "defense of U.S. territory" from the Caribbean direction. Under this fictitious pretext, broad-scale military preparations are being implemented here which envision the creation of a "mailed fist" and the conduct of military exercises and maneuvers on which variants of interference in the internal affairs of Latin American states are worked out. This "demonstration of military muscle" is also called upon to frighten neighboring countries and to demonstrate the ability of the United States to "defend its interests." According to data in the foreign press, a joint strike formation of ground forces, the Air Force, and the Navy is being turned over to be at the disposal of the headquarters mentioned above--a unique type of Latin American analog of the "Rapid Deployment Force."

During "crisis situations," to which the Pentagon refers the intensification of revolutionary activity in Central America and the Caribbean basin, the intensity of flights by U.S. reconnaissance aviation increases, which increases tension in the region. In addition, U.S. ships, including aircraft carriers, are sent to this area for combat patrolling. Nuclear submarines are appearing in the basin of the Caribbean Sea. According to data in the foreign press, by the beginning of March 1981 an armada of American ships numbering more than 40 units was assembled in the Caribbean Sea. In addition to existing U.S. bases in Puerto Rico, in the so-called Panama Canal Zone, on the Bahama and Virgin Islands, and on Cuban territory (Guantanamo), the American militarists intend to create new military installations on the territory of other states. Haiti and the Dominican Republic were mentioned in this connection in the Western press.

The entire set of means which the United States uses to place one or another country under its control was demonstrated in the most cynical manner in Salvador. This small country was the object of coarse interference of American imperialism under the pretext that here, as is asserted in Washington, "a new Cuba is maturing." The new Republican administration, not yet succeeding in feeling properly at home in its offices in the White House, rained down upon the entire world a storm of provocative declarations that it succeeded in discovering in Salvador the "hand of Moscow," the "hand of Havana," the "hand of Managua," and so forth. When proof was demanded from the authors of these sensations, something incomprehensible resounded in the reply: they said that the boats in which hundreds of foreign "agents" arrived in Salvador were made from wood which is not found in Salvador; it looks as if "standard NATO automatic rifles of Belgian manufacture are widely used" in this country and they arrive "from the reserves of the Cuban government"; and finally, allegedly "105-mm howitzers of American manufacture which were captured by the North Vietnamese in 1975" were discovered in Salvador "and they were unloaded from a Lebanese vessel."

All these fabrications are "full of holes." And they have one goal--to hide behind a dense screen of lies those who actually are accomplishing direct, blatant interference in the internal affairs of Salvador. We are speaking primarily of the Pentagon and of its allies in Central America--reactionary militarists who are ruling in Salvador's neighboring countries--Guatemala and Honduras. In accordance with reports in the foreign press, American C-130 aircraft regularly deliver to the military airfield of Ilopango, which is located not far from the capital San Salvador, large lots of small arms, grenade launchers, and ammunition and, in disassembled form, military helicopters which are then assembled here by specialists of the U.S. Air Force. American "advisors" in Salvador, the number of which exceeded 1,000 men, are accomplishing the direct leadership of operations in combing the terrain, being part of the punitive subunits of the Salvadoran army. Plans have been worked out for the transfer of ships to the Caribbean Sea from other areas of the world and for the organization of a sea and air blockade on the junta's "request." Not being satisfied with this, the Reagan administration declared its intention to expand sharply the volume of military assistance for the junta, allocating for these purposes 123 million dollars in the current fiscal year.

For what do these resources go? Whom do those who shout so furiously to the entire world about their striving to put an end to "international terrorism" help? Here is what a French correspondent for the Newspaper MONDE who recently visited Salvador saw there. "...A woman in black, who has grown old before her time, slowly lifts her eyes from the corpse of her child who was killed two hours earlier by the blows of a machete: throat cut, stomach with stab wounds, hands and knees cut off.... Three men were mowed down by a machinegun burst from a helicopter which flew above the plantations very low, like a hunting dog following a scent in the grass.... A soldier of the Salvadoran National Guard threw up two babies one after the other and caught them on the tip of his machete. This is how the brutal mercenaries of the junta settle things in trying to frighten by terror those who are called 'communist insurgents' in government communiqués."

In long-suffering Salvador, American imperialism is trying to conduct a practical test of criminal plans for the internalization of conflict. Under Washington's pressure, the direct participation of the armed forces of Guatemala and Honduras in the civil war in Salvador is expanding. According to data of the Columbian Coordination Committee for Solidarity with the People of Salvador, accelerated training of foreign mercenaries who have expressed readiness to participate in the suppression of the patriotic struggle of the Salvadoran people to overthrow the hated junta is being conducted on the island of (Ikitos) (Puerto Rico) under the direction of military instructors from the Pentagon. Finally, highly-placed American representatives openly state that they "do not exclude" the possibility of landing American Marines on the territory of Salvador. And this is not a simple threat. According to data in the foreign press, of 199 U.S. military actions abroad which were undertaken without a declaration of war for the period from 1798 through 1972, more than 80 occurred in Central America and the Caribbean basin.

Recently, the CIA widely initiated its terrorist activity in the region which contributed greatly to the replacement of democratic governments on Jamaica, in the Dominican Republic, on Saint Lucia, and in other states of the Caribbean basin. According to evidence in the journal COVERT ACTION, it is namely this which stood behind attempts at the physical destruction of the head of Grenada's progressive government, M. Bishop.

Washington's adventuristic course in the area of Central America and the Caribbean basin is causing serious concern even in the United States. A group of members of the House of Representatives adopted a resolution warning the White House against unconsidered actions. "The United States," it states in it, "evidently has set forth on a course which will bring it neither victory nor honor, as has already happened once in Vietnam." T. Shaw, a famous American specialist on South American countries, also wrote about this in the newspaper NEW YORK TIMES: "American political strategists should keep in mind the lessons of Vietnam when they begin to consider the next step in Central America."

Concerning the question of the possibility of American intervention in Central America and the Caribbean basin, the newspaper WASHINGTON POST noted that the Pentagon is persistently seeking a "convenient" range to demonstrate the readiness of the U.S. Marines to "prove that they can win a war against partisans." The most "acceptable," from the viewpoint of American military strategists, would be combined operations of the armed forces of several Latin American states, under the cover of which "Leathernecks," as the Marines are called in the United States, would also operate. Such plans under the code name "Sandwich" were already exposed in the world press at the beginning of 1981. At that time the Americans had not decided on its implementation. However, similar plans and bilateral and multilateral agreements of the United States with reactionary regimes in Central America continue to remain in force. The strengthening of adventuristic, militaristic trends in Washington's policy, foreign specialists believe, makes the danger of intervention rather real. This is also shown by the fact that the American militarists, regardless of Panama's protests, conducted the "Black Hawk" maneuvers in February 1981 in the so-called Panama Canal Zone--where U.S. military bases are still retained. The direction of these exercises, in which 5,000 men took part, was absolutely specific--military operations against "communist insurgents and partisans" were worked out. The conditions for the conduct of the maneuvers were close to Salvador conditions.

This is how the Pentagon reacts to the victories of the national-liberation and revolutionary-democratic movement in Central America and the Caribbean basin. With the assistance of a policy of military dictatorship and relying on puppet terrorist pro-American regimes, U.S. imperialism is trying to halt the historically inevitable processes of the national and social liberation of the peoples.

COPYRIGHT: "Zarubezhnoye voyennoye obozreniye", 1981.

6367

CSO: 1801/343

PERCEPTIONS, VIEWS, COMMENTS

REPLY TO READERS ON TASKS OF UNITED NATIONS TROOPS

Moscow ZARUBEZHNOYE VOYENNOYE OBOZRENIYE in Russian No 5, May 81 (signed to press 7 May 81) pp 17-20

[Article by Col G. Petrukhin: "Troops of the United Nations"]

[Text] United Nations troops are contingents of armed forces of United Nations member countries which have been placed at the disposal of the Security Council to maintain international peace. The Security Council (SC), which has been endowed with broad powers in the field of adopting measures to maintain international peace, can demand of states engaged in armed conflict that they accomplish certain obligations, including cessation of fire and withdrawal of troops to initial positions, and can also employ measures of compulsion which are not connected with the use of armed forces (economic, diplomatic, and so forth). If these methods of settlement prove to be insufficient it can, using ground forces (air forces, navies) undertake actions which it considers necessary to maintain or restore international peace. The question of whether UN troops can employ military force to accomplish the assigned missions is decided depending on the conditions for the conduct of a specific operation and the mandate received. In principle, the accomplishment of operations for the maintenance of peace does not envision the conduct of military operations by contingents of UN troops. They are directed to use the weapons which they have only in case of self-defense. However, in practice situations may arise where the mandate of the UN troops is expanded and they will be directed to have recourse to operations with the employment of weapons.

In the solution of problems connected with the use of armed forces, as is written in the UN Charter, the Security Council considers the opinion of its auxiliary organ--the Military Staff Committee which is assigned overall direction of the allotted troops. Its functions include the duty to provide recommendations and assist the SC in all questions which pertain to the military requirements of this organization in the matter of maintaining international peace and security. However, since 1948 the committee's work on these problems has virtually ceased. And what is more, its use is virtually not envisioned in the functioning organizational structure which has been created in accordance with the simplified scheme (Security Council-Secretary General-troop commanders).

The commander of troops is appointed by the Security Council, General Assembly, or UN Secretary General. Thus, the Secretary General, with the agreement of the SC, appointed the Finnish Lieutenant General Sillasvuo commander of the "UN Emergency

Armed Forces in the Near East" in 1973. The commander usually implements operations and observes all types of troop activity but he is not endowed with disciplinary authority. The officers who command the units and subunits have the right to impose punishment on servicemen.

The UN troops are created from national contingents of the armed forces of UN member nations in accordance with special agreements concluded in each specific case between these countries and the Security Council, but only for the period necessary for the accomplishment of missions envisioned in Article 42 of the Charter. The member states of this organization have assumed obligations to offer units and subunits and the appropriate means for servicing as well as other assistance upon the requirement of the Security Council. Their composition should be determined on the basis of the principle of just representation and with consideration of the geographic factor. In practice, they are usually represented by several (five-seven) battalions and other support and service subunits (4,000-7,000 men) as well as by airplanes, helicopters, and ships. The strength and armament of the subunits are different and depend basically on the organizational and staffing structure of the national troops.

Imperialist circles have repeatedly violated the charter principles of the United Nations which pertain to the troops placed at the disposal of this organization. Thus, in 1950 the United States imposed on the Security Council the decision to send so-called "UN Armed Forces" to Korea where big troop formations of 15 capitalist countries (primarily large units and units of the United States) were actually used. The "UN troops" are still in South Korea where they are represented only by the American contingent. And in several other cases "UN troops" were used illegally by the imperialists; in this, the missions which were assigned to them were often distorted. Such actions led to interference in the internal affairs of the states which accept these troops and to the transformation of UN operations to maintain peace into police actions. The principles of activity of "UN Armed Forces" were violated especially coarsely in the Congo (1960) where they were employed against the national liberation movement of this country's people.

The positive shifts in the international arena permitted strengthening the role and significance of the United Nations in the sphere of the maintenance and restoration of universal peace. For example, the personnel of the "UN Emergency Armed Forces in the Near East" were made up of national contingents from Austria, Ghana, Indonesia, Ireland, Canada, Kenya, Nepal, Panama, Peru, Poland, Senegal, Finland, and Sweden, which ensured balanced participation in the operation by states located in different geographic areas and belonging to various military and political groups.

The aggravation of the international situation and the outbreak of new military conflicts also make for the employment of UN troops in our time. For example, the "UN Forces to Observe the Separation of Syrian and Israeli Troops on the Golan Heights," which were created by the decision of the Security Council in May 1974 in connection with Israel's aggression against Syria, now include subunits of the armed forces of Austria, Canada, Poland, and Finland (altogether about 1,300 men). Their assigned mission is to ensure the cease fire and to monitor the observance of the provisions of the agreement on separation. For the accomplishment of these functions a buffer zone two to six kilometers in width was established in which the UN troops are located to exclude the presence of subunits of the opposing sides in it.

In March 1978 Israel executed an armed attack against Lebanon, occupying a considerable part of the territory in the country's southern part. The "Temporary UN Forces for Southern Lebanon," which initially consisted of 4,000 men, were created to eliminate the aftereffects of Israeli aggression. Now, it actually numbers about 5,000 men from the following countries: Ghana, Ireland, Italy, the Netherlands, Nigeria, Nepal, and Norway. Their composition includes four separate battalions (of various manning status) and support and service subunits. For example, the separate infantry battalion and headquarters company of Ireland's armed forces number about 750 officers and men and they are equipped with organizational small arms and military equipment.

The UN operation to maintain peace on the island of Cyprus is not yet completed, either. The decision for the creation of the "UN Peace-Keeping Force on Cyprus" was adopted in March 1964. It was initially allocated for a three-month period, and then its authority was repeatedly extended by subsequent SC resolutions for three and six months.

In accordance with the UN decision, the strength of the troops should be 7,000 men, but practically it was always less (in 1970--3,182 men). Now, these troops are represented by British, Austrian, Canadian, Danish, Irish, Finnish, and Swedish units and subunits with a total strength of about 2,500 men.

In accordance with the decision of the commander of these troops, the island is arbitrarily divided into five operational zones. Prevention of the renewal of battles between Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots in each of them was assigned to national contingents of UN troops. In addition, mobile engineer units of mixed national subunits were created whose mission included the destruction of fortifications, obstacles, and so forth.

The zone commanders are required to prevent the renewal of armed conflicts by placing UN units between the warring sides, but they do not have the right to disarm any of them. It is permitted to employ weapons only for the defense of UN posts, premises, and transportation against armed attack and in the case of assisting other UN personnel who have found themselves in a critical situation. Force can be employed only to protect peaceful citizens. One of the important missions is combating the contraband importing of weapons. Patrolling and observation of roads are accomplished for this and check points are created whose detail has the right to look through and search individuals and transportation which have come under suspicion in connection with the transportation of weapons.

The situation on Cyprus has improved somewhat in recent years but, probably, the final solution to the problem can be found only after all foreign armed forces are withdrawn from the country and normal living conditions are created for both national communities of Cyprus.

Military observers in missions and other organs instituted by the Security Council have also taken part in many UN operations, for example, "The UN Observer Group" in Lebanon (1958), the "UN Observer Mission in Yemen" (1962), the "UN Observation Mission in India and Pakistan" (1965), and so forth.

UN operations to settle conflicts conducted in various regions of the world show that the use of UN armed forces to ensure the cessation of military operations or the separation of troops of the warring sides may contribute to raising the effectiveness of this organization in restoring and maintaining international peace and security. However, up to now the imperialist forces have not abandoned attempts to use UN troops for their mercenary motives. Thus, the authors of the anti-Arab Camp David Agreement intended to determine individually and without the agreement of the Security Council the composition of the "UN Emergency Armed Forces in the Near East," to change the solution of the question on the procedure for their command, and so forth. Under these conditions, on the decision of the Security Council in the middle of 1979 the operation of UN troops on the Sinai Peninsula was discontinued.

Recently, Western countries have been trying to concentrate in the hands of the Secretary-General unjustifiably great authority in the leadership of UN troops, as they succeeded in doing in the years of the "cold war." In this way, they are trying to prevent the conduct of operations in strict conformance with the UN Charter and to concentrate in the hands of such an apparatus as the UN Secretariat unjustifiably broad powers in the solution of problems in the daily direction of operations of UN troops. Such attempts are legally groundless and politically unacceptable for peoples of the world. They serve the goals of the struggle with national-liberation movements and interference in the internal affairs of developing countries.

COPYRIGHT: "Zarubezhnoye voyennoye obozreniye", 1981.

6367

CSO: 1801/343

PERCEPTIONS, VIEWS, COMMENTS

COMMENTS ON U.S. EXPENDITURES FOR RADIOELECTRONIC WARFARE

Moscow ZARUBEZHNOYE VOYENNOYE OBOZRENIYE in Russian No 5, May 81 (signed to press 7 May 81) pp 25-26

[Article by Engr-Col V. Afinov: "Expenditures of the United States on the Creation of Radioelectronic Warfare Equipment"]

[Text] The expenditures of Western countries on equipping armed forces with the means for radioelectronic warfare (REB) are growing at accelerated rates in recent years. According to the estimate of American specialists, in 1981, 1982, and 1983 they will comprise respectively 4.2, 4.8, and 5.2 billion dollars, more than 80 per cent being the share of the United States--3.5, 3.9, and 4.6 billion.

In fiscal year 1981, it is planned to distribute appropriations for REB resources among the services of the armed forces in the following manner: 698.3, 837.0, and 1,208.5 million dollars are being allocated respectively to the Army, Navy, and Air Force, of them for the development of new means--321.3, 469.0, and 423.1 million and 377.0, 368.0, and 785.4 million for their purchase. In addition, 733.5 million dollars are being allotted to the central organs of the U.S. Department of Defense.

As the foreign press notes, the main expenditures of the United States in the field of radioelectronic warfare are going for creation of means for the individual protection of airplanes and ships against enemy guided weapons to increase their survivability under the conditions of contemporary war. In the opinion of American specialists, improvement of REB means for individual protection of combat equipment will permit reducing the effectiveness of guided weapons in the inventory of the probable enemy by approximately four- to five-fold. It is envisioned that this equipment will be installed on each warship, airplane, and helicopter. It includes detectors of radar emission sources, stations for the active jamming of weapons control systems, devices for the scattering of antiradar reflectors and infrared decoys, and small jamming transmitters for one-time use.

Big appropriations are also being allocated for the development of special (in the interests of group defense) aviation equipment for radioelectronic suppression and destruction by fire of ground-based air defense radar posts and the creation of means for jamming radio communication and equipment for radio and radio-technical reconnaissance which, as the American press admits, even in peacetime is directed against important defense installations of the Warsaw Pact countries.

COPYRIGHT: "Zarubezhnoye voyennoye obozreniye", 1981.

6367

CSO: 1801/343

PERCEPTIONS, VIEWS, COMMENTS

COMMENTS ON USE OF PROPAGANDA LEAFLETS BY U.S. ARMED FORCES

Moscow ZARUBEZHNOYE VOYENNOYE OBOZRENIYE in Russian No 5, May 81 (signed to press 7 May 81) p 26

[Article by Lt Col A. Tarakanov: "Use of Leaflets in Psychological Warfare Operations"]

[Text] Leaflets are one of the most widespread forms of printed propaganda materials employed by subunits of the U.S. Armed Forces in psychological warfare operations. Regulations define the content, form, color, and types of leaflets and recommendations are given for their preparation with consideration of the missions to be accomplished and the nature of the targets of influence. According to their content, they are divided into persuasive, information, directive, and pass leaflets, and by purpose--into standard and specific.

Persuasive leaflets are called upon, in the period of successful operations of enemy troops, to distort the actual picture of the situation which has developed and to convince him of the possibility of a rapid change in the combat situation. It is intended to use information leaflets in those cases where the state of affairs is not developing in favor of the enemy, which is also indicated by the facts contained in them. Directive leaflets are employed when, according to intelligence data, the enemy is psychologically prepared to implement certain conditions (for example, surrender). They are also intended for underground forces and political groups which are on territory occupied by the enemy and support the policy of the United States. Pass leaflets are distributed among the servicemen of the opposing side in a certain combat situation and are a document which "facilitates" surrender or crossing over to the territory of a neutral country or to areas occupied by allied troops. To create the impression of an official document, these leaflets have a special form, color, and size. As a rule, a seal and a facsimile of the signature of the commander of U.S. armed forces in the theater of operations are placed on them.

Standard leaflets are prepared ahead of time for specific purposes. In the opinion of foreign specialists, it is better to use them in a rapidly changing situation where printed materials corresponding to a new situation cannot be prepared. Catalogs are created for their classification and convenience in selection. Specific leaflets have a specific purpose and are intended for one-time use under circumstances which are rarely repeated.

Western specialists believe leaflets to be an important means of subversive propaganda, which is determined by the possibility of preparing, printing, and distributing them operationally in large quantities.

COPYRIGHT: "Zarubezhnoye voyennoye obozreniye", 1981.

6367

CSO: 1801/343

PERCEPTIONS, VIEWS, COMMENTS

COMMENTS ON OFFENSIVE EMPLOYMENT OF U.S. TANK BATTALION

Moscow ZARUBEZHNOYE VOYENNOYE OBOZRENIYE in Russian No 5, May 81 (signed to press 7 May 81) pp 27-31

[Article by Col A. Yegorov, candidate of military sciences, docent: "The U.S. Army Tank Battalion in the Attack"]

[Excerpts] In its aggressive plans which are directed against the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, the military leadership of the United States is devoting great attention to the training of subunits, units, and large units of the ground forces for the conduct of offensive operations in various theaters of operations under conditions of nuclear as well as conventional war. In the American military press, it is stressed that now the offensive capabilities of the ground forces have been increased significantly through equipping them with improved combat equipment and the latest weapons systems. Success in contemporary battle, in the opinion of the U.S. Army command, is determined primarily by the shock action, firepower, armored protection, and high mobility of the troops. These properties are possessed to the greatest degree by armored troops whose basic subunit is the tank battalion.

As evidenced by the foreign military press, tank battalions are part of armored, mechanized, and infantry divisions (six, five, and one battalions respectively). They have the same organization, armament, and equipment and are directly subordinate to the division commander. For the period of the battle, the tank battalion is usually resubordinated to one of the brigades of the division, as part of which it accomplishes its combat mission.

The organizational structure, personnel, and basic armament of the tank battalion are shown in Figure 1 and in the table [not reproduced]. In contrast to similar ground force subunits of other NATO countries, the composition of the U.S. Army tank battalion includes a mortar platoon (four 106.7-mm self-propelled mortars) which is intended for the destruction of enemy personnel and antitank weapons, the neutralization of artillery and observation posts, laying smoke screens in case of necessity, and the employment of illumination rounds with the conduct of battle at night. The battalion also has organizational air defense weapons (five firing sections with six sets of "Red Eye" antiaircraft guided missiles in each) and antitank guided rocket launchers (four "TOW" and four "Dragon" guided weapons) which are in the armament of the reconnaissance platoon. The presence of the latter, as noted in the foreign press, gives the tank battalion certain independence and permits it to accomplish its assigned combat missions more effectively.

Having contemporary armament and possessing powerful shock action, high mobility, and maneuverability the tank battalion, in the opinion of foreign specialists, can be used successfully in different types of battle and, first of all, in the attack. At the same time, it is stressed in the foreign press that under contemporary conditions tank subunits require support from motorized infantry, field artillery, air defense weapons, tactical and army aviation, and engineer subunits in coordination with which the greatest effectiveness in their employment in offensive battle is attained.

In accordance with the views of the U.S. Army command the tank battalion, which comprises the second echelon (reserve) of the brigade, should be used for exploitation of the success attained by the first echelon. It can also replace subunits of the first echelon which have suffered considerable losses from nuclear and fire strikes or destroy tactical assault landings and large centers of resistance in the rear of friendly troops.

In conclusion, it should be noted that the American command, in considering tank subunits as the main shock force of the ground forces, is constantly looking for ways for a further improvement in their structure and the tactics for their conduct of combat operations.

COPYRIGHT: "Zarubezhnoye voyennoye obozreniye", 1981.

6367

CSO: 1801/343

PERCEPTIONS, VIEWS, COMMENTS

COMMENTS ON SPAIN'S AIR FORCE AND TIES WITH NATO

Moscow ZARUBEZHNOYE VOYENNOYE OBOZRENIYE in Russian No 5, May 81 (signed to press 7 May 81) pp 43-48

[Article by Maj N. Belkin: "The Spanish Air Force"]

[Excerpt] Because of its important military-strategic position on the European continent, Spain has long attracted the fixed attention of the U.S. and NATO leadership. Nurturing aggressive plans against the Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist commonwealth, the militaristic circles of the West are striving to transform Spain into its military beachhead, draw it into the orbit of the arms race and, in the last analysis, pull it into the aggressive North Atlantic bloc.

As noted in the foreign press, these efforts have not gone in vain. Spain first proceeded to develop bilateral collaboration with the United States, offering it military bases, and then began to strengthen ties with the other states which are members of NATO. Now, according to the expression of many Western observers, Spain is the "16th unofficial member of the North Atlantic Alliance" and soon, despite the active resistance of the country's progressive forces, will join it. In exchange for close collaboration with the bloc's states, Spain is receiving from them, and first of all from the United States, comprehensive military assistance which is being used for the continuous build-up of its armed forces, including the Air Force.

Accomplishment of the following basic combat missions has been assigned to Spain's Air Force: gaining and retention of air superiority, covering the country's important objectives and groupings of troops from air strikes, direct air support of the ground forces, aerial reconnaissance, and the air lifting of personnel and combat equipment.

The organization, composition, combat training, and prospects for the development of the Spanish Air Force are presented below from data published in the foreign press.

COPYRIGHT: "Zarubezhnoye voyennoye obozreniye", 1981.

6367

CSO: 1801/343

PERCEPTIONS. VIEWS, COMMENTS

COMMENTS ON ACTIVITIES OF U.S. AIR FORCE TEST SQUADRON

Moscow ZARUBEZHNOYE VOYENNOYE OBOZRENIYE in Russian No 5, May 81 (signed to press 7 May 81) p 49

[Article by Engr-Col D. Valentinov: "The U.S. Air Force 4484th Test Squadron"]

[Text] As the foreign press reports, the Tactical Aviation Combat Applications Center (Eglin Air Force Base, Florida) includes several air subunits including the 4484th Test Squadron which has been assigned the following missions: evaluating the combat effectiveness of air weapons systems which are in the inventory and are being accepted in the inventory and retraining and determination of the level of combat training of crews from various units of American military aviation.

The squadron is manned primarily by personnel who have experience in the conduct of combat actions acquired, in particular, during the aggressive war which was unleashed by the United States in Southeast Asia. In addition to tests of various types of weapons and aviation equipment, the squadron is engaged in working out the tactical conduct of air combat operations including problems in planning, coordination, the accomplishment of flight, coming out in an attack, and weapons employment.

In testing air-to-air weapons and working out methods for the conduct of aerial battle, primarily the PQM-102 radio-controlled targets and the BQM-34 unmanned aircraft are used as targets. The annual limit allotted to the squadron is 16 PQM-102's and as many BQM-34's. As evidenced in the Western press, the arrival of the QF-100 unmanned targets is expected beginning in 1983.

The results of the tests and evaluations obtained in the squadron are used to adjust plans for the combat training of personnel of U.S. military aviation, to improve aviation armament and equipment at the plants, and to conduct the necessary modifications in the units.

For example, the evaluation of the combat readiness of air units equipped with F-4 aircraft which was conducted in 1978 showed that the level of training of their crews with their conduct of air battles had dropped noticeably. In the opinion of American specialists, one of the basic reasons for this was the increase in the volume of drills in working out problems connected with the launching of strikes against ground targets. Considering this, the command of the U.S. Air Force planned the retraining of the personnel of these units in the 4484th Squadron for 1980

and 1981. In 1980, 468 crews passed through it from Air Force units based on the territory of the United States and in Western Europe as well as from National Guard subunits. Usually, six primary and several auxiliary crews from one unit underwent retraining (as a rule, for one or two weeks). In the course of it simulated and practical launchings of the medium range "Sparrow" and close aerial combat "Sidewinder" guided missiles were accomplished.

In the 1970's, an evaluation of "Sparrow" guided missiles (AIM-7E and F) and the "Sidewinder" (AIM-9E, J, L, and P) guided missiles was accomplished in this test squadron. It was noted that among the latter best reliability was demonstrated by the AIM-9L guided missile. Beginning with the end of 1980, the squadron personnel have been evaluating these missiles during launching from F-4 and F-15 aircraft and the arrival of a subunit of F-16 aircraft is expected in the immediate future from the 388th Air Wing of the U.S. Air Force Tactical Air Command (Hill Air Force Base, Utah). Subsequently, it is planned to determine the combat effectiveness of several models of air small arms-cannon armament as well as of new air-to-air guided missiles and means for radioelectronic warfare.

The Western press notes that defects and malfunctions of aviation weapons and equipment are often disclosed in the course of tests. Thus, the spontaneous separation of the cable for switching on the power unit for controlling the AIM-7F missile was disclosed. Instances of the switching of the safety-actuating mechanism of the fuse to the unarmed state (under the influence of vibrations in flight) were noted in it, which turns on the circuit for switching on the engine of the guided missile during a combat launch. With consideration of this, missiles located in the depots as well as in the units were modified. Discovered in the launchers of the AIM-7F guided missiles (on F-15 aircraft) was the slow triggering of the pyrotechnic cartridges intended for ensuring the forced separation of the missile during launch, which led to the incorrect operation of the automatic devices and the loss of the guided missile. Subsequent analysis showed the presence of defects in an entire lot of installed pyrotechnic cartridges and they were replaced.

In testing the F-15 aircraft, specialists of the squadron established that although the weapon control system automatically calculates and displays the minimum range for launching a missile at a target on collision courses on a scope, due to the great closing speeds after giving the command to launch even beyond the limits of the minimum permissible range its separation occurs already in the zone for prohibiting launchings. This situation was reflected in the appropriate manner in the pilot's instructions.

In the opinion of Western military experts, the list of work conducted in the 4484th Test Squadron presented above is sufficient for an understanding of the basic trends in the activity of this subunit and a critical evaluation of the combat capabilities of the models of weapons and the systems for controlling them which are produced by the U.S. war industry and which are advertised so widely by the American press.

COPYRIGHT: "Zarubezhnoye voyennoye obozreniye", 1981.

6367

CSO: 1801/343

PERCEPTIONS, VIEWS, COMMENTS

COMMENTS ON AIR-TO-SURFACE TACTICAL MISSILES

Moscow ZARUBEZHNOYE VOYENNOYE OBOZRENIYE in Russian No 5, May 81 (signed to press 7 May 81) pp 50-56

[Article by Engr-Lt Col B. Semenov: "Air-to-Surface Tactical Guided Missiles"]

[Excerpt] In their military preparations, the militaristic circles of the leading imperialist states allot an important place to equipping airplanes and helicopters with contemporary offensive weapons. They are placing special hopes on air-to-surface guided missiles (UR) since, in their opinion, this type of weapon permits the most effective accomplishment of the missions assigned to aviation to destroy various ground and water targets. Depending on the specific designated purpose, foreign military specialists divide these guided missiles into air-to-surface, antiship (air-to-ship), antiradar, and antitank. The characteristics of each of the missile types is given below and the trends in their development are examined.

COPYRIGHT: "Zarubezhnoye voyennoye obozreniye", 1981.

6367

CSO: 1801/343

PERCEPTIONS, VIEWS, COMMENTS

COMMENTS ON NATO NAVAL TRAINING IN THE ATLANTIC

Moscow ZARUBEZHNOYE VOYENNOYE OBOZRENIYE in Russian No 5, May 81 (signed to press 7 May 81) pp 59-63

[Article by Capt 2d Rank V. Khomenskiy: "Combat Training of NATO Navies in the Atlantic"; passages enclosed in slantlines printed in boldface]

[Text] The military-political leadership of the aggressive NATO bloc considers the Atlantic as one of the main ocean theaters of war. Its significance, according to the estimate of Western military specialists, is determined primarily by the fact that passing through here are routes of communication over which it is intended to accomplish the strategic lifting of troops and cargoes from the United States and Canada to reinforce the bloc's OVS [combined armed forces] in Europe. In addition, the Atlantic links the military-industrial regions of the North American continent with Europe, the Near East, and Africa. The most important types of raw materials, primarily oil and petroleum products, are transported over its lines of communications for the NATO member countries.

Considering the special importance and great spatial scope of this theater, the bloc's leadership created two commands of the NATO OVS here: strategic (supreme) in the Atlantic, and the main--in the zone of the English Channel. The armed forces of these commands are represented primarily by the naval forces.

As the foreign press notes, in peacetime the naval forces are under national subordination and are transferred to NATO in case of war, with aggravation of the international situation, or for the period of exercises. Their operational and combat training within the framework of the bloc is planned and accomplished in such a way as to work out in peacetime all problems connected with the transfer of the forces of national fleets to subordination to the NATO command, the formation of multinational forces of combined naval forces, and their employment in various types of wars.

As evidenced in the foreign press, in the course of combat training great attention is devoted to the employment of the latest types of weapons (primarily missiles) and the equipment of ships, submarines, and naval aviation, to improvement of tactical procedures for the conduct of combat operations under conditions of REB [radioelectronic warfare], and to the study of the effect of new types of ships and their weapons systems on improving the capabilities and effectiveness of employment of naval forces in various operations at sea. These problems are worked out as

part of type and mixed forces and multinational groups primarily in the course of standard exercises of combined and national fleets.

The naval forces of the North Atlantic bloc's countries were involved in approximately 50 exercises in 1980; of them, approximately 20 were conducted in the Atlantic and in the zone of the English Channel. In the course of them, as is stressed in the Western press, the following primary missions were accomplished: the conversion of naval forces from peacetime to wartime status in accordance with the alarm system in effect in NATO, the transfer of units and ships to subordination to the bloc's command, the formation of task forces and groups for various specific missions and their deployment in destination areas, the destruction of enemy ships and submarines in the interest of achieving supremacy at sea, rendering direct air and ship support to ground forces in European theaters of operation, supporting the lifting of troop reinforcements to Europe, the conduct of amphibious warfare operations, the protection of communications, and the antilanding defense of islands and coasts.

In addition, an important place in combat training was devoted to supporting the activity of nuclear missile submarines, the NATO strike fleet in the Atlantic, and the special strike force for operations under extraordinary conditions, combating submarines on antisubmarine lines and in individual regions of the sea, laying minefields (including by B-52 aircraft of the U.S. Strategic Air Command), and the conduct of antimine operations under conditions of the mass employment of mines.

The majority of the missions listed above were worked out in their entirety on the exercise of combined NATO forces, "Team Work," which took place 10-24 September 1980 (conducted once in four years). It was a component part of a series of NATO exercises, "Autumn Forge," and was a unique summing up of the results of operational and combat training of the NATO combined military forces in the Atlantic, in the zone of the English Channel, and in the Northern European theater of operations. Foreign specialists consider it to be the biggest (along with exercise "Northern Wedding-78") in the last four years for spatial scope and composition of the forces involved.

The exercise area encompassed the Northeastern Atlantic, the zone of the English Channel, the North Sea, the western part of the Baltic Straits, the territory of Norway, and the northern part of Great Britain. Participating in it were more than 30 combined and national commands and headquarters, about 60,000 men, more than 170 warships (including the American nuclear aircraft carrier "Chester W. Nimitz" (Figure 1) [not reproduced], the assault helicopter carrier "Iwo Jima", the general-purpose landing ship "Saipan", the British assault helicopter carrier "Bulwark" (Figure 2) [not reproduced], 400 airplanes and helicopters of strategic, tactical, carrier, and land-based patrol aviation of navies and air forces of the United States, Great Britain, Canada, the FRG, the Netherlands, Norway, Belgium, Portugal, and France, units and subunits of marines and ground forces, and men and equipment of the combined NATO air defense system in Europe.

The main point of the exercise was the amphibious operation for transporting an expeditionary brigade of U.S. Marines across the Atlantic on landing ships of the strike fleet's amphibious force and its joint landing with the 3d Brigade of the British Marines and a Netherlands amphibious group on an unimproved coast in the area of Kristiansand (southern Norway) during darkness. On the entire route

of this force's sea crossing and in the landing area, it was covered by a multi-purpose carrier group (the carrier "Chester W. Nimitz").¹

In addition, carrier forces were involved in exercises "Safe Pass" and "Open Gate." They were part of the strike fleet and a special strike force for operations under extraordinary conditions whose main areas of maneuver were the Western Atlantic, the Norwegian and Northern Seas, and the western approaches to the Strait of Gibraltar. The composition of the escort forces of the carrier groups varied and depended on the assigned missions and the degree of threat on the part of the probable enemy.

According to evidence in the foreign press, one of the indispensable conditions for the successful operations of naval forces is /winning supremacy of the sea/ in areas strategically important to NATO. They were worked out on all exercises with the participation of fleets and envisioned the combined use of various services of armed forces and combat arms. Surface ships, nuclear submarines, and carrier aviation participated in the fight against "enemy" groupings of surface ships. Tactical aviation was used to launch strikes against ships at a distance of up to 400 kilometers from the coast. Groups of missile and torpedo boats (two or three boats in each) were also used in coastal skerry areas of the Northern European theater of operations to destroy surface ships.

Depending on the nature of the target and possible counteraction, carrier aircraft accomplished flights as part of strike groups (three-four attack aircraft and two or three fighters) or singly, primarily during daylight, at a distance of up to 270 miles (500 kilometers) from the carrier. Their guidance was accomplished by "Hawkeye" DRLO [long-range radar spotting aircraft--AWACS]. "Strikes" were launched from one or several directions from a shallow dive or pitch-up with guided missiles, free rockets, aerial bombs, and small-arms and cannon weapons. The number of sorties flown in 24 hours when using carrier-based attack aircraft was up to two aircraft sorties per day.

A special place in accomplishing missions in winning sea supremacy was allotted to antisubmarine warfare operations which were worked out in the course of the exercises indicated above as well as on special antisubmarine exercises--"Joint Maritime Course" /kos/, "Flotex," and others. Procedures and tactics of operations for the search, tracking, and "destruction" of submarines by maneuver antisubmarine forces in individual regions of the Atlantic were improved on them, and the organization of all types of defense of naval forces, amphibious detachments, and convoys in a sea crossing was checked as were joint operations of antisubmarine warfare ships, submarines, and land-based patrol aircraft on antisubmarine lines jointly with the SOSUS fixed system for long-range sonar observation. Surface ships operated as part of carrier and ship hunter-killer groups. Carrier-based antisubmarine warfare helicopters were widely used.

In the accomplishment of antisubmarine warfare missions, an important place was allotted to the permanent NATO naval force in the Atlantic which includes five-seven ships. According to reports in the foreign press, its peacetime mission is the conduct of joint combat training of ships of different nationalities, while in

¹ For greater detail about exercise "Team Work-80," see ZARUBEZHNOYE VOYENNOYE OBOZRENIYE No 1, 1981, pp 67-71. [Editor].

wartime it will be used as the forward echelon of antisubmarine forces in the Eastern Atlantic prior to the deployment of main naval forces in areas of combat assignment. The force was involved in the majority of naval exercises conducted in 1980 and also conducted independent combat training in the Western and Eastern Atlantic to work out the tactics of operations in the accomplishment of antisubmarine missions. For the time of independent exercises, it was also joined by submarines and auxiliary vessels of the naval forces of the European NATO countries. In the course of a year, the training of about 20 ships of 9 bloc countries took place in the force.

As formerly great attention was devoted to the combat training of land-based patrol aviation which is considered by foreign military specialists as one of the most effective means for combating submarines. In the course of exercises, its airplanes accomplished missions of disclosing the surface and submarine situation and "destroying" or guiding friendly strike forces to detected "enemy" submarines and surface ships. In the daily patrolling and during exercises, the "Orion," "Nimrod," "Neptune," and "Atlantic" airplanes investigated vast water expanses using sonobuoys, magnetic detectors, gas analyzers, and radar and visual means of observation. The "destruction" of submarines was accomplished by torpedoes and depth charges. In individual cases airplanes were used to lay minefields in coastal waters and on convoy routes. Reinforcement of airplane groups of land-based patrol aviation in the Eastern Atlantic was accomplished by shifting American and Canadian "Orion" and "Argus" antisubmarine airplanes to Iceland and Great Britain.

On all of last year's exercises, great significance was attached to the /conduct of amphibious operations/, especially on the bloc's northern flank whose grouping of armed forces, in the opinion of the military-political leadership of the North Atlantic Alliance, requires reinforcement in crisis situations. In the course of the exercises of recent years, the marines of the United States, Great Britain, and the Netherlands have been assimilating various regions on the coast of northern and southern Norway and are working out procedures for the conduct of combat operations under difficult arctic conditions. As stressed in the Western press, the NATO command is trying to reduce the time to transfer Marine forces from the United States. This is why, under its pressure, the government of Norway adopted the decision to prestock weapons and combat equipment on the country's territory for the U.S. Marine expeditionary brigade. According to the estimate of NATO specialists, this will permit airlifting the brigade's personnel with light weapons in short times.

The landing of amphibious forces was accomplished primarily on an unimproved coast with the use of floating assault-landing equipment and troop-carrier helicopters. The crossing of the assault detachments to the landing area was supported by close-escort forces, carrier aircraft, and land-based patrol aircraft. Direct support of the assault forces during the landing and the conduct of offensive combat operations to expand the beachhead on the shore was rendered by carrier aviation and, on exercise "Team Work-80," by U.S. Marine aviation which was transported to Norwegian airfields during the "threatened" period.

The direction of the combat training of the combined NATO naval forces is shown by the ever-increasing attention of its command to questions of the /defense of sea communications/ and, first of all, in the Eastern Atlantic and the English Channel. It is believed that the requirement for the constant delivery of military cargoes

for troops and strategic raw materials for the needs of the economy and the redistribution of human and material resources among various units of the theater of operations determine the necessity for the uninterrupted functioning and reliable protection of routes of communication. The defense was organized in accordance with the zonal principle and was directed primarily toward the defense of convoys at the places where they are formed and unloaded as well as on the sea crossing. Accomplishment of this mission was attained by the combined employment of all naval arms as well as shore-based aviation. The forces and weapons of the Atlantic zone of the combined NATO air defense system in Europe went into action to cover the convoys and naval forces from the air.

In the course of exercises, an important place was allotted to /antimine support/ of the activity of aircraft carriers, amphibious assault, and antisubmarine warfare forces. Departure of warships from naval bases and ports was accomplished only after the check sweeping of channels by minesweepers and helicopter minesweepers. Intensively used for these purposes was the permanent mine-sweeping force in the zone of the English Channel whose composition was increased to 12 minesweepers for the time of big exercises. On the exercise "Team Work-80," it operated as part of shipboard sweeping groups and ensured the safety of approaches to the assault force's landing area in Kristiansand (Norway) and accompanied convoys with military cargoes and items of logistical support behind the sweeps in the North Sea and the zone of the English Channel.

Last June, the force also participated in a demonstration exercise in the English Channel which was organized for representatives of the NATO military-political leadership. Its operations for the search, sweeping, and disarming of mines were worked out jointly with the permanent force of NATO naval forces in the Atlantic. In addition, it involved mine-sweeping forces in special exercises, in particular in an exercise which took place in the zone of the English Channel 15-27 May 1980. In addition to the permanent force, 40 warships, auxiliary vessels, and minesweepers --mine detectors and helicopter minesweepers--were put into action.

In addition, missions in the /antisubmarine, air defense, antimissile, and antiboat defense/ of ships and forces in the crossing of the sea were accomplished on all exercises. Here, the air defense of carrier groups and detachments of landing ships was accomplished by escort ships in close coordination with the forces and equipment of the combined NATO air defense in Europe. The defense of an aircraft carrier in the near and intermediate zones was provided by close escort ships at a distance of 30-40 miles (55-75 kilometers) and ship hunter-killer groups allocated to the threatened directions while long-range protection was provided by land-based patrol aircraft, "Viking" carrier-based aircraft, and hunter-killer groups.

The /logistical support of ships/ in naval bases and ports and at sea was accomplished according to the national principle. The supplying of ships of the American naval forces was accomplished from tankers and transports which were part of the forces. Fuel and water supplies were transferred under way using the beam method.

In connection with repeated breakdown incidents on oil and gas complexes in the Norwegian and North Seas as well as on ships and in fleet aviation during daily activity and in the period of exercises, in recent years the NATO command has begun the systematic working out of /damage control operations/ in the course of the

special exercises "Bright Eye" [ēā]. In 1980, exercises of this type were conducted in the summer-autumn period. Surface ships, rescue vessels, submarines, and carrier-based airplanes and helicopters were involved in them.

On the whole, measures for the operational and combat training of NATO combined naval forces in the Atlantic and in the zone of the English Channel, according to the estimate of the foreign military press, encompassed all questions in the use of carrier, amphibious, antisubmarine, and minesweeping forces as well as naval aviation in close coordination with the air forces and ground forces in the first operations of the initial period of limited war. The combat training, which took place under conditions of the complication of international tension, shows graphically that certain circles in the West have not abandoned intentions to revive the spirit of the "cold war" and to place the world at the edge of military catastrophe despite the interests of the peoples.

COPYRIGHT: "Zarubezhnoye voyennoye obozreniye", 1981.

6367

CSO: 1801/343

PERCEPTIONS, VIEWS, COMMENTS

COMMENTS ON PHYSICAL TRAINING PROGRAM OF U.S. MARINES

Moscow ZARUBEZHNOYE VOYENNOYE OBOZRENIYE in Russian No 5, May 81 (signed to press 7 May 81) pp 65-70

[Article by Col (Ret) V. Sukhotskiy, candidate of pedagogical sciences, docent: "Physical Training of the U.S. Marines"]

[Excerpts] The Marines--the strike detachment of American imperialism--consist of mobile, well armed troops which are constantly ready for immediate lift by sea and air to any region on Earth to suppress the national-liberation movement of peoples and to defend the predatory interests of the United States ruling circles.

According to reports in the foreign press, one of the factors which ensure the high degree of combat readiness of the Marines is the good physical training of the personnel. However, as shown by the experience of World War II as well as the aggressive wars in Korea and Vietnam, although it was better than that of the servicemen of the ground forces, it nevertheless proved to be insufficient. The Marines clearly did not have sufficient endurance and applied military knowledge and skills necessary for operations in various theaters of operations.

These shortcomings were subsequently considered and, as stressed in the foreign press, measures have now been worked out for further improvement of the system for physical training of Marine personnel which is being conducted in accordance with manuals and instructions on physical training and sport in the Army and Navy. It is also noted that tests and standards of physical readiness are worked out separately for Marines.¹

The Marine command is devoting increased attention to physical training and sport and is monitoring their status strictly. All Marines, regardless of age, rank, and service status, are required to participate in "an effective program of physical strengthening on a permanent and progressive basis." Officers have been assigned the task to stimulate subordinates by personal example for the improvement of their physical training the high level of which, in the opinion of American military

¹ By physical readiness of the serviceman is meant his having good health and the absence of physical defects as well as the ability to accomplish strained physical work for a long period and to restore his strength rapidly. The components of physical readiness are strength, endurance, dexterity, and the coordination of movements [Editor].

specialists, has a favorable influence on the morale of the servicemen and reduces to a minimum such disciplinary delinquencies as absence without leave, drunkenness, the use of drugs, and others.

As shown by the foreign press, the goal of Marine physical training is maintaining them in constant physical readiness for combat operations on any terrain, under various climate conditions, and at various times of the year and day. In order to attain this, tasks in the combined development of strength, muscular and cardio-respiratory endurance, and reaction speed are accomplished. The improvement of these qualities is combined with the working out and consolidation of skills in walking and running over broken terrain, in jumps and crossing natural and artificial obstacles, crawling, carrying loads, and so forth.

Great attention is devoted to the instilling of boldness and resolve and overcoming a sense of uncertainty and fear when accomplishing such difficult elements as climbing trees and tall buildings, movement by rope, jumping from a height, and cliff climbing. An important role is allotted to teaching swimming in clothing and with a weapon, jumps into the water from the side of a ship, and procedures for rescuing drowning men and giving them first aid.

According to reports in the Western press, the following programs of physical training exist in the Marines: for training centers and military schools; for regular troops; for specialists and headquarters personnel; for Marines on board ships; and to restore physical readiness.

The leadership of physical training in the Marines is accomplished by staffs. The planning, recording, and monitoring of it are assigned to one of its officers. Lessons with personnel are conducted by instructors from among the noncommissioned officers under the observation of platoon and company commanders. As a rule, they are physically well-trained and master the skills of instructional-methods work. Large units and units have sports councils which assist commanders in organizing sports measures. Sports instructors from among noncommissioned officers answer for sports work in platoons and companies.

Physical training of the Marines is conducted not only in regular units, but also in reserve units during summer training assemblies.

All the data presented above show the great significance which the command of the U.S. Navy attaches to the physical training of Marine personnel.

COPYRIGHT: "Zarubezhnoye voyennoye obozreniye". 1981.

6367

CSO: 1801/343

PERCEPTIONS, VIEWS, COMMENTS

READERS COMMENT ON USEFULNESS OF 'FOREIGN MILITARY REVIEW'

Moscow ZARUBEZHNOYE VOYENNOYE OBOZRENIYE in Russian No 5, May 81 (signed to press 7 May 81) p 80

[Article: "Leningrad Seamen on the Journal"]

[Text] At the beginning of March of this year, conferences with readers of the journal ZARUBEZHNOYE VOYENNOYE OBOZRENIYE were conducted in the Naval Academy imeni Marshal of the Soviet Union A. A. Grechko and in the Central Naval Library.

The participants in the conferences evaluated highly the journal's significance for indoctrinating Soviet servicemen in a spirit of devotion to the cause of the CPSU and the socialist motherland, proletarian internationalism, constant vigilance, and high combat readiness. In their opinion, it furthers the ideological-political growth and expansion of the horizon of our servicemen, exposes the aggressive nature of imperialism's military preparations, and helps to understand more deeply the direction of the organizational development and to study comprehensively the weapons and combat equipment of the armed forces of the capitalist countries. The journal's materials are widely used in training officers in military educational institutions and in scientific work.

In the statements, it was noted that recently the ideological-theoretical level of the journal has been raised, the subject matter of the articles has been expanded, and the form of presentation, literary editing, and artistic appearance have been improved.

At the same time, several critical remarks, desires, and recommendations for a further rise in the quality of published materials were addressed to the editors. All these suggestions are now being studied and will be considered in subsequent work as the possibility arises.

The editorial collective and editorial board of the journal ZARUBEZHNOYE VOYENNOYE OBOZRENIYE sincerely thank the organizers of the conferences and all readers who took part in them for the great preparatory work and for the advice and desires expressed. The editors express their special gratitude to Comrades V.A. Gusev, G.A. Smirnov, V.S. Vostrikov, B.S. Nikol'skiy, Yu.F. Tarasyuk, A.S. Fedurin, and others.

COPYRIGHT: "Zarubezhnoye voyennoye obozreniye", 1981

6367

CSO: 1801/343

END

END OF

FICHE

DATE FILMED

25 Nov-1981